

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE ON ELECTRIC RESTRUCTURING

RESULTS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SYSTEM BENEFITS CHARGE

September 30, 2005

The New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission hereby submits to the legislative oversight committee on electric restructuring its annual report on the results and effectiveness of the system benefits charge (SBC).¹ The SBC is a charge assessed on all electric customers to fund public benefits related to the provision of electricity. The SBC is currently capped at \$0.003 or 3 mils per kWh. Funds collected through this charge are divided between energy efficiency and conservation programs and low income assistance programs, with 1.8 mils per kWh devoted to energy efficiency and the remaining 1.2 mils per kWh allocated to the low income electric assistance program..

The energy efficiency and conservation programs are offered to residential, commercial and industrial customers of each of the state's electric utilities, that is, Unitil Energy Systems, Granite State Electric Company, New Hampshire Electric Cooperative and Public Service Company of New Hampshire. The low income assistance programs are offered by all four electric utilities, but only to residential customers.

Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs

Energy Efficiency. Two principal goals of the program are to achieve cost effective energy savings and to transform the market for energy efficiency measures. Based on information provided by the utilities earlier this year, from the inception of the programs in June 2002 through December 31, 2004, SBC-funded energy efficiency programs in New Hampshire provided services to approximately 111,000 customers with associated projected lifetime kilowatt-hour (kWh) savings of 2.3 billion kWh, or enough energy to power Concord for 6 years. The utilities estimate that \$250 million has been saved by customers over this 2½ year period, with corresponding emissions reductions of more than 1.5 million tons. That is the equivalent of the annual emissions of 330,000 cars.²

In 2004 alone, the utilities state that energy saved will reduce electric bills by \$104.5 million, based on a projected 925 million lifetime kWh savings achieved, having served more than 51,130 customers (nearly 50,000 residential customers and over 1,100 businesses). These energy savings translate into a total emissions reduction of 545,178 tons of CO₂, 916 tons of SO_x, and 338 tons of NO_x, equivalent to taking more than 114,000 cars off the road. This exceeded the original emissions reduction goal for 2004. In fact, the 2004 programs exceeded goals filed with the Commission in October 2003 in terms of customers served, projected kWh savings achieved, and overall dollar savings.

¹ This report is filed pursuant to RSA 374-F:4,VIII (f). The SBC is authorized by RSA 374-F:3,VI.

² The estimate of automobile emissions reduction is based on the emissions profile of a 2003 Toyota Camry, and assumes each vehicle is driven 12,500 miles.

For 2004, it cost 1.8 cents to achieve each kWh saved, compared to the average retail price of 11.3 cents per kWh.

In 2005, based on the most recent report submitted to the Commission, which covers the period from January 1, 2005 through June 30, 2005, the programs continue on pace to exceed the stated goals for 2005. The following table, excerpted from the report, provides program-by-program summary data showing expenses, savings, and number of actual customers and those who have committed to participate thus far. Based on these figures, as well as recent projections from the utilities, we anticipate that the programs will continue to meet or exceed their goals for the year.

CORE NH Program Highlights
(January 1 - June 30, 2005)

NH CORE ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS	EXPENSES (\$)		SAVINGS (Lifetime kWh)		NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS	
	Actual + In Process + Prospective	Percent of Budget	Actual + In Process + Prospective	Percent of Budget	Actual + In Process + Prospective	Percent of Budget
RESIDENTIAL (nhsaves@home)						
ENERGY STAR Homes	\$1,167,049	84%	7,628,350	284%	781	117%
Home Energy Solutions	\$1,247,970	65%	34,663,778	80%	1,309	129%
Home Energy Assistance	\$1,259,050	57%	21,510,699	71%	887	90%
ENERGY STAR Lighting	\$1,193,790	91%	67,893,395	91%	137,916	101%
ENERGY STAR Appliances	\$759,605	103%	25,400,597	112%	10,346	102%
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL	\$5,627,464	74%	157,096,819	91%	151,239	101%
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL (nhsaves@work)						
Small Business Energy Solutions	\$1,449,074	61%	69,222,315	86%	354	86%
Large Business Energy Solutions	\$4,974,630	129%	388,656,670	160%	278	93%
New Construction	\$2,195,070	81%	173,483,999	74%	210	108%
TOTAL COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL	\$8,618,774	96%	631,362,984	113%	842	93%
TOTAL	\$14,246,237	86%	788,459,803	108%	152,081	101%

Detail regarding individual utility performance and analysis of individual programs, including definitions of actual, in process, and prospective customers, is available on the Commission's website at:

<http://www.puc.state.nh.us/Electric/coreenergyefficiencyprograms.htm>

The following table shows the amount of money collected for energy efficiency and conservation programs through the SBC from January 1, 2005 through June 30, 2005:

<u>Company</u>	<u>SBC Funds Collected</u>
Public Service of New Hampshire	\$ 7,135,468
Unitil Energy Systems	\$ 1,097,799
Granite State Electric	\$ 775,736
<u>New Hampshire Electric Cooperative</u>	<u>\$ 687,643</u>
Total	\$ 9,696,646

Market Transformation. As described above, the programs to date have exceeded expectations with respect to the first of the two primary goals, cost effective energy savings. Whether appreciable progress has been made on the second goal, transformation of the market, is less clear. There is a legitimate concern that largely rebate-driven programs may not be the most effective way, over time, to transform the market for energy efficient products and services. The utilities have been asked to address the issue of market transformation in their upcoming filings.

Finally, we note that one program in particular, the residential Home Energy Assistance (HEA) program which serves low income customers in New Hampshire, has recently received recognition from the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE) as an exemplary low-income energy efficiency program. The New Hampshire section of the September 2005 ACEEE report is excerpted and included as an attachment to this report. The full report is available at: <http://aceee.org/pubs/U053.htm>. Given that this particular program faced some hurdles during its initial roll-out in June 2002, the Commission is especially pleased to be able to report on this recent achievement.

Low Income Program

In May 2002, the Commission approved a statewide tiered discount low income electric assistance program. Designed to reduce the electric bills of participating customers to 4% of income on average for non-electric heat customers and 6% of income on average for electric heat customers, the program provides long term bill assistance to income eligible customers. The program, which began on October 1, 2002, will complete its third year of operation on September 30, 2005.

RSA 374-F:4, VIII (c) authorizes the funding of the low income electric assistance program through the system benefits charge. Customers of Granite State Electric Company, New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, Public Service Company of New Hampshire and Unitil Energy Systems support the program through a 1.2 mil or \$.0012 per kWh charge on electric bills. The authority of the Commission to impose the low-income system benefits charge ends on June 30, 2008, having been extended by the most recent session of the General Court.

During the initial program year, more funds were collected than were paid out in benefits and expenses. This imbalance was due to the ramping up of program enrollment during the first year. During this past program year, participation reached 27,000 households. The original projection for program participation was 23,000 households; however, the program was able to provide benefits to a greater number of customers through the use of the funds that accumulated during the first program year. In March 2005, although there were still funds available that had accumulated during the first program year, the rate of depletion of the ramp-up monies was accelerating. Because the program fund could not continue to support the 27,000 enrollment level, on March 26, 2005, a waiting list was put into place for the program.

As of August 31, 2005, the enrollment level had dropped to 23,210. While this is the enrollment level the program originally was projected to serve, increases in rates for electric utility service have increased the level of benefit needed to reduce bills, on average, to 4% and 6% of income. When the program opened on October 1, 2002, the average benefit level was \$35 per month. In the month of August 2005, the average benefit paid to participants was \$53. At its current funding level, projections show a sustainable enrollment level to be approximately 17,500. In August 2005, the Commission opened Docket DE 05-124 to review the proposed budget for the 2005/2006 program year and evaluate recommendations recently submitted by the electric assistance program advisory board. These recommendations include changes to the electric assistance program eligibility level, the method of prioritizing the waiting list, and the pre-program arrears component. Further, they address the use of reserve funds over the next program year to meet the immediate needs of the program. A copy of those recommendations is attached.

From October 1, 2004 through August 31, 2005, the low income portion of the system benefits charge generated \$12,026,463 in revenue. An additional \$32,565 was paid by the utilities on the program reserve balances held for total funding over the 11 month period of \$12,059,028. During the same time frame, \$12,560,596 in discounts was applied to customer bills, and \$578,341 in arrears was forgiven for total benefits paid to customers of \$13,138,937. The average benefit paid to participants in the electric assistance program is \$548 per year as compared to an average benefit of \$472 per year during the 2003/2004 program year. Between October 1, 2004 and August 31, 2005, \$1,401,093 was paid in expenses. Those expenses not only included 2004/2005 program year costs but also \$5,762 of expenses incurred during the 2003/2004 program year which was carried over and paid in the 2004/2005 program year. The budget for administrative expenses for period October 1, 2004 through September 30, 2005 is \$1,518,569 or 11.5% of the projected program funding of \$13,200,838 for the 12 month period. This is a slight decrease over the prior program year and a \$400,000 or 3% decrease in administrative costs compared to the fixed credit percentage of income assistance program originally proposed to the Commission by the parties. As of July 29, 2005, there was a fund balance, held by the State Treasurer, of \$555,835 and a reserve balance of \$1,227,302.

As of August 31, 2005, 23,210 households representing 55,734 people were enrolled in and receiving benefits from the electric assistance program. Since the program began in October 2002, more than 61,000 households representing 150,564 people have received benefits from the program. The six Community Action Agencies, as administrators of the program, have seen approximately 80,600 applications for the electric assistance program since its start, demonstrating the need for an electric bill assistance program.

Poverty Level	Number or Households Enrolled as of 8/31/2005	Number Of Persons Enrolled as of 8/31/2005
Under 75%	4953	13688
76% - 100%	4816	10226
101% - 125%	4738	10363
126% - 150%	4392	10302
151% - 175%	3253	8445
176% - 185%	1058	2710
Total	23210	55734

Information regarding the number of program participants and the benefits paid since program inception, broken out by town, is attached.

A review of the program data indicates the electric assistance program has had success in making bills more affordable for program participants. Sixty eight percent of program participants make a complete or partial payment on their electric bill each month. Additionally, aging of accounts receivables data provided by the utilities show that electric assistance program customers, while slower, are not significantly slower in paying their electric bills than non-electric assistance program customers.

*Comprehensive Low-Income Energy Efficiency Programs
Exemplary Program*

NHSAVES@Home, Home Energy Assistance Program

*Public Service of New Hampshire
Granite State Electric
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative
Unitil
Southern New Hampshire Services
Tri-County Community Action Agency
Southwestern Community Services
Belknap-Merrimack Community Action Agency
Rockingham Community Action Agency
Strafford County Community Action Agency*

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The Low Income Retrofit Program (marketed as the *NHSAVES@Home, Home Energy Assistance Program*), began on July 1, 2002. This program is designed to help income-qualified customers manage their energy use and reduce their energy burden. The program is collaboratively implemented with several governmental and community organizations. Community action agencies (CAAs) are charged with determining program eligibility through income levels and number of household members. The same services are offered to all qualified candidates in the State of New Hampshire, regardless of utility.

The New Hampshire utilities developed a set of core energy efficiency programs that were approved by the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (NHPUC). Home Energy Assistance is included as part of these programs. Administration of the program is coordinated by the state's four electric utilities and delivered to customers by NH's six Community Action Agencies. By adopting a program design which incorporates the CAAs and the federal and state programs they operate, customers can receive up to 100% more services than they would with a program funded solely by the utilities.

The program leverages funding from several sources including Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program, Heating Replacement and Repair Program, the HUD Home Program via NH Housing Authority, Department of Environmental Services Oil Tank Replacement Program, local Gas company Retrofit Programs and the State of NH Community Development Block Grants.

The program process includes customer intake, scheduling and performance of the audit, the performance of quality assurance (QA) activities on 10% of participants following installation and services, and job close-out activities. The program offers improvements such as insulation, air sealing, thermostat replacement, electric hot water conservation measures, appliance and lighting upgrades and appropriate health and safety measures. The program also has an educational component specifically tailored for income-eligible customers and

designed to help them better understand their home and the factors that effect energy use. The program is coordinated closely with the Electric Assistance Program (EAP) and Fuel Assistance programs to help identify eligible customers. The program is marketed through the utilities, CAAs and other community agencies in three languages. While all income eligible customers may participate in this program, working with EAP participants to reduce their energy burden has the further benefit of increasing the EAP funds available to other customers.

The program is open to both single and multi-family households, regardless of heating fuel type. Utility personnel administer the program and contract for the delivery of program services. The table below lists the measures that are offered through the program.

List of Measures Offered in Home Energy Assistance Program

Measure
Appliance Timer
Air-Sealing
CFL
Lighting Fixtures
Torchieres
Thermostat
Heat Pump Tune Up
Insulation
Window (utility specific)
Refrigerator/Freezer
Waterbed Insulation
Water Saving Measures

The program uses a holistic approach to home weatherization using state of the art modeling software and data tracking to provide each customer with the “best practice” for their home. This software allows auditors to address each home holistically and treat each home uniquely, identifying and addressing all potential energy savings measures without compromising occupant health and safety. This software involves two components:

1) Targeted Residential Energy Analysis Tool (TREAT) is an energy analysis software tool that allows the field auditor to input site-specific information from which the software generates annual kWh and kW savings values, payback years and savings-to-investment ratios (SIRs) for individual measures or packages of improvements. It models air leakage improvements, fuel conversions, window replacements, added insulation, appliance and lighting upgrades, heating and cooling replacements, duct work improvements, hot water, ventilation, controls and more.

2) Online Tracking Tool for Energy Retrofits (OTTER) applies common New Hampshire utility avoided costs and measure life assumptions to the annual savings from TREAT to screen for cost effectiveness. It is a database-driven web application and is the common entry point for all users of the program to see the online tracking system. The program

provides the repository for all utility, customer, contractor, subcontractor, work order tracking, and quality assurance data that are to be common to all users.

The OTTER component was developed specifically for the New Hampshire utilities and was designed to ensure that all program participants receive consistent treatment and have access to the same efficiency measures regardless of the utility serving them. Data extracted from the TREAT/OTTER software is used to determine average savings and costs for each of the measures listed in the table above.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

The tables below summarize program results for 2004.

Table of Cost Effectiveness 2004

Customers Served	Annual Kilowatt Hours Saved	Lifetime KilowattHours Saved	Utility Program Cost	Customer Cost	Cost per lifetime Kilowatt Hour Saved
1083	3,338,087	56,747,489	\$2,390,373	0	\$.042

Table of Average Savings per customer served 2004
Based on \$.115 per Kilowatt Hour

Average Utility Cost per Customer	Average Annual Cost Savings	Average Annual Kilowatt Hours Saved	Average Payback in Years	Average Project Life
\$2,207.18	\$354.43	3,082	6.2 years	17 years

The program achieves relatively high electricity savings per household because it specifically focuses on electrically heated and high KWH use homes. Most of these homes use in excess of 3,000 KWH each month during the heating season. Many of these are multi family homes where the tenant does not pay for the heat—providing no incentive not to have the thermostat set relatively high in heating mode. Consequently, installation of electronic setbacks and "range programmable" thermostats yield significant savings. Home Energy Assistance provided services to many fossil fuel homes in 2003 and 2004, but the majority of homes were electrically heated. As the program matures it will provide services to greater numbers of fossil-fuel heated homes. In addition to the typical weatherization and envelope measures implemented for electrically heated homes, additional electricity savings are achieved from replacement of incandescent bulbs with CFLs, and installation of water flow restrictors for electrically heated water as well as installation of pool and appliance timers, where applicable. The program also replaces inefficient refrigerators and freezers with ENERGY STAR® products. Most homes in this program receive this full package of efficiency improvements.

Only minor changes have been made to the program. The program contribution per customer was originally capped at \$3,600. That was increased to \$4,000 in 2004. While the average home received somewhat less than \$2000 in cost effective measures, homes occasionally receive substantially more. Program staff found some customers had to be served over a two year span to “complete” the home. Increasing the cap allowed service providers to visit the home once, lowering administrative costs. If well managed, the program would work best with no cap.

The program organized a non-utility best practices organization to educate auditors and contractors involved in the delivery of energy efficient measures. The Residential Energy Performance Association (REPA) is an association of home energy raters and auditors whose mission is; “Facilitate sharing of energy efficiency technology while promoting uniform professional standards”. The purpose of this organization is to facilitate market transformation in New Hampshire by helping raters and auditors produce consistent, high quality audits and installations.

LESSONS LEARNED

- This represents the first time New Hampshire has had a common statewide program providing comprehensive fuel-blind safety and efficiency services free of charge to income eligible customers.
- Collaborating funds among all agencies has been highly beneficial to all program recipients. Leveraging DOE weatherization dollars and other federal and state dollars through community action agencies enabled the program to maximize the benefit to each recipient while keeping administrative costs low.
- Contractor involvement is important from the start. Seeking and using feedback from all users and managers has helped the program improve service and delivery.
- Taking a holistic approach and using modeling software and a tracking system that supports this approach provides each home with a unique mix of cost effective measures without compromising indoor air quality. Each home gets what it needs, no more, no less.
- Employing a reputable and passionate quality assurance (QA) contractor has improved all aspects of the program. This contractor continues to work with service delivery contractors to improve their technical knowledge and installation practices.
- Facilitating the creation of a “best practices” organization among contractors and sub-contractors can yield numerous program benefits. Such an organization should ultimately be run by the contractors, with utility representatives participating in meetings and other activities. Such an organization provides a forum where contractors can:
 - Share the best methods of dealing with typical and atypical weatherization issues,
 - Present issues and concerns to the utility as a group,
 - Introduce new technology and techniques,
 - Share success and failure stories, and
 - Train new contractors.

The program continues to improve each year and continually seeks new ways to help customers reduce their energy burden. Customer surveys show a high satisfaction.

PROGRAM AT A GLANCE

Program name: NHSAVES@Home, Home Energy Assistance Program

Program eligibility (guidelines): The program is open to all customers who meet the eligibility criteria for participation in the Fuel Assistance Program (185% of federal poverty), the NH Electric Assistance Program, the DOE Weatherization Program and anyone living in subsidized housing.

Program start date: The program began on July 1, 2002 as an eighteen month pilot. It has since changed to an annual program operating on a calendar basis.

Program participants: For the 18-month pilot period (June 2002—December 2003) there were 1,362 participants. In 2004 there were a total of 1,083 participants.

Approximate eligible population: While there are approximately 27,500 customers presently enrolled in the Electric Assistance Program, the eligible population is much higher and changes annually.

Annual energy savings achieved: 4,030 annual MWH for the initial 18-month period (June 2002–December 2003); in 2004 the program yielded 3,338 annual MWH.

Cost effectiveness: B/C ratio of 1.32 for July 2002 thru December 2003 and 1.97 for program year 2004.

Budget and cost information: \$3,273,660 for July 2002 thru December 2003 and \$2,390,373 for program year 2004

Funding sources and share of program budget: The program leverages funding from several sources including utility systems benefit charges, Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program, Heating Replacement and Repair Program, the HUD Home Program via New Hampshire Housing Authority, Department of Environmental Services Oil Tank Replacement Program, local Gas company Retrofit Programs and the State of New Hampshire Community Development Block Grants.

Best person to contact for information about the program:

- Robert Montmarquet—Program Administrator, PSNH
- Telephone: 603-634-2518
- Fax: 603-634-2449
- E-mail: montmrm@psnh.com
- Postal address: PO Box 330 Manchester, NH 03105-0330
- Web site: www.nhsaves.com

Electric Assistance Program Advisory Board
Recommendations for the 2005-2006 Program Year

During this past program year, participation in the Electric Assistance Program (EAP) reached 27,000. The original projection for program participation was 23,000 customers; however, the program was able to provide benefits to a greater number of customers through the use of funds that accumulated during the first program year as participation levels were ramping up. In March 2005, although there were still funds available that had accumulated during the first program year, the Advisory Board concluded that it was necessary to begin to reduce the number of participants as the funds that accrued during the ramp-up were being spent down and the EAP fund could not continue to support the current enrollment level. As a result, on March 26, a waiting list was put into place for the EAP. The Advisory Board believed that, through attrition, the enrollment levels would be reduced to a sustainable level by the end of September.

As of August 31, 2005, the enrollment level dropped to 23,185. While this is the enrollment level the program originally was projected to serve, increases in rates for electric utility service have increased the level of benefit needed to reduce bills, on average, to 4% and 6% of income. When the program opened on October 1, 2002, the average benefit level was \$35 per month. In the month of August 2005, the average benefit paid to participants was \$53. At its current funding level, the Commission Staff has projected the sustainable enrollment level to be approximately 17,500. However, to compensate for the higher enrollment levels today and the additional dollars being paid out in benefits and future increases in electric rates, Staff has projected that the enrollment level will need to decline to 17,000 and the reserve will need to be drawn on to meet the financial obligations of the program.

Based on the above, the Advisory Board offers the following recommendations to the Commission for the 2005/2006 EAP program year:

1) EAP program reserve: During the first year of the program, a reserve equal to 10% of the low-income portion of the SBC revenues collected during that year was established. In accordance with Commission Order No. 24,036 issued in DE 02-034, during the first year of the program, each utility withheld 10% of the low-income SBC collected each month to establish a program reserve. Those reserve funds are held by the utilities and total \$1,227,302.22.

The EAP is a statewide program not a utility specific program. Accordingly, the reserve was designed to be for the program as whole. Because each utility holds a portion of the reserve, however, it becomes administratively difficult to draw from the reserve should it be necessary to meet the needs of the EAP. Accordingly, the Advisory Board recommends that the Commission authorize the four electric utilities - Granite State Electric, New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, Public Service of New Hampshire, and Unitil - to transfer funds

from the reserve balances they hold to the State Treasury for deposit in the EAP account. Further, the Board recommends that this transfer of reserve funds occur as necessary to meet the obligations of the program.

The Commission Staff monitors the fiscal status of the EAP and performs updated financial projections on a monthly basis. The Advisory Board recommends that Staff utilize the monthly financial projections to anticipate any shortfall of funds in the EAP account held by Treasury. Staff would then notify each utility of the amount to be transferred from the reserve for inclusion in the utility's reconciliation report for the month in which the shortfall is anticipated. The allocation of the reserve would be based on the percentage of the reserve held by each utility.

2) EAP eligibility level: Currently, the total household income of EAP applicants must be at or below 185% of the federal poverty guidelines (FPG). In May 2002 when the Commission approved the tiered discount EAP, the eligibility level was set at 150% of the FPG. However, in April 2003, as part of a settlement agreement in DE 03-195, the parties recommended that the eligibility level be raised to 185% of the FPG. The Commission approved the settlement containing the new eligibility level in May 2003.

As described above, the EAP enrollment level is above a sustainable level. Approximately 3900 participants have not re-certified since the waiting list was implemented in March 2005, bringing the enrollment level to 23,073 as of September 9, 2005. However, the Commission Staff's projections show the sustainable level for EAP to be approximately 17,500. Fiscal projections prepared by the Commission Staff for the September 16, 2005 Advisory Board meeting show that, at the current attrition rate, the funds which accumulated in the State Treasury account during the program ramp up will be depleted by November 2005 and reserve funds will need to be used to meet the financial obligations of the program. While Staff's projections show that there are sufficient funds in the reserve to continue to meet the program obligations during the transition to a sustainable participation level, the Advisory Board believes it is appropriate to take steps to accelerate the transition period, thus improving the financial outlook of the program and shortening the period of time for individuals on the waiting list. The Advisory Board believes that the attrition rate would be higher if the eligibility level were changed from 185% of the FPG to 150% of the FPG. By lowering the program eligibility level to 150% of the FPG, approximately 4311 current EAP participants would not be eligible for the EAP when their current certification period ends. In addition, the Advisory Board believes the program can be better targeted to the more vulnerable households if the eligibility level is reduced. Absent a reduction to the eligibility level, with more than 3300 customers currently on the waiting list, the Advisory Board is concerned that households in a higher FPG bracket will continue to receive benefits while households on the waiting list in lower FPG brackets will not be able to receive benefits. While this problem can never be entirely eliminated,

reducing the eligibility level does improve the targeting ability of the EAP. Accordingly, the Advisory Board recommends reducing the eligibility level to 150% of FPG for the 2005/2006 program year.

3. Waiting List: When the EAP was first approved, the waiting list was established as “first on-first off.” The Commission, through the EAP procedures manuals, asked the Advisory Board to revisit the issue of prioritizing the waiting list eighteen months after the start of the program. As the program had no experience with a waiting list and there was no imminent need for one at the end of the first eighteen months of the program, the Advisory Board deferred revisiting the waiting list issue. Today a waiting list exists, and the Advisory Board now has sufficient information to make an informed recommendation to the Commission on how the waiting list should be prioritized. It is unlikely that all customers on the waiting list would be enrolled in the EAP during the 2005/2006 program year. Prioritizing the waiting list by the federal poverty guidelines will better target assistance to those who most need it. The Community Action Agencies have indicated that there is no difference in the administrative cost of prioritizing the waiting list by the federal poverty guidelines and of prioritizing it by the date the customer went on the waiting list. The Advisory Board therefore recommends the waiting list be prioritized by the federal poverty guidelines and those most in need would be enrolled in the program first.

4) Regulatory Assets: Once the enrollment level reaches a sustainable number, the annual revenues coming in to fund the EAP and the annual expenses to support participant benefits and program administration will be equal during each program year. However, the monthly revenues may not always match the monthly expenses. In some months, revenues may exceed expenses; and in others, expenses may exceed revenues. Consequently, after the transitional period is over and the EAP enrollment has reached a sustainable level, the Advisory Board recommends that if, in any given month, the EAP funds held at the State Treasury are insufficient to reimburse a utility for the amount of its EAP expenses in excess of its EAP-SBC collections, the utility be authorized to collect such funds from future EAP revenues, thereby allowing the utility to establish a regulatory asset for the under-recovery until such funds can be collected from future EAP revenues. The Advisory Board further recommends that such deferred recoveries be reviewed by Staff during its monthly reconciliation of EAP revenues and costs and that the Advisory Board be notified when such a deferral occurs.

5. Pre-program Arrears: In light of the financial projections for the 2005/2006 program year, the Advisory Board recommends the pre-program arrears component be suspended for the upcoming program year while the EAP transitions to a sustainable enrollment level. The Advisory Board recommends this issue be reviewed prior to the start of the 2006/2007 program year to determine if it would be financially viable at that time.

During its discussions regarding changing the eligibility level and the method of prioritizing the waiting list, it was clear that these changes could be made on a going forward basis. The Advisory Board also considered whether these changes could be applied to those who were already on the waiting list. Of particular concern was whether those individuals had a vested right that would be violated by a change in the eligibility level or the prioritization method for the waiting list. The Advisory Board believes a vested right has not been created for several reasons. First, the EAP has always clearly been a program for which participation is based on availability of funds. Changes to the eligibility level and waiting list prioritization simply impact the availability of funds to individuals on the waiting list. Secondly, in the procedures manuals approved by the Commission, it was clear that the issue of how the waiting list was prioritized would be revisited. Thirdly, the Commission had approved changes to the program rules in May 2003, clearly indicating that the EAP was not a static program.

ELECTRIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (Revised 10-10-05)
FOR HOUSEHOLDS ENROLLED SINCE PROGRAM INCEPTION
OCTOBER 2002 THRU AUGUST 2005

<u>TOWN</u>	<u>Number of Households</u>	<u>Number of Household Members</u>	<u>Discount Paid To Customers</u>	<u>Pre Program Arrears</u>	<u>Average Benefit per Household</u>	<u>Average Benefit per Household Member</u>
Acworth	73	166	\$ 27,994	\$ 142	\$ 385.42	\$ 169.49
Albany	76	188	\$ 43,936	\$ 923	\$ 590.25	\$ 238.61
Alexandria	76	188	\$ 37,908	\$ 683	\$ 507.77	\$ 205.27
Allenstown	447	1068	\$ 194,968	\$ 5,080	\$ 447.53	\$ 187.31
Alstead	144	370	\$ 62,856	\$ 133	\$ 437.42	\$ 170.24
Alton	234	593	\$ 100,346	\$ 1,808	\$ 436.55	\$ 172.27
Amherst	149	401	\$ 96,017	\$ 2,117	\$ 658.62	\$ 244.72
Andover	101	248	\$ 50,208	\$ 343	\$ 500.51	\$ 203.84
Antrim	215	526	\$ 89,027	\$ 1,452	\$ 420.83	\$ 172.01
Ashland	8	21	\$ 5,635	\$ -	\$ 704.39	\$ 268.34
Atkinson	59	130	\$ 12,539	\$ 69	\$ 213.70	\$ 96.98
Auburn	89	249	\$ 60,191	\$ 1,279	\$ 690.68	\$ 246.87
Barnstead	177	467	\$ 90,715	\$ 2,199	\$ 524.94	\$ 198.96
Barrington	306	687	\$ 171,336	\$ 3,579	\$ 571.62	\$ 254.61
Bartlett	144	330	\$ 72,752	\$ 1,101	\$ 512.87	\$ 223.80
Bath	75	157	\$ 37,252	\$ 325	\$ 501.03	\$ 239.34
Bedford	164	344	\$ 85,988	\$ 629	\$ 528.15	\$ 251.79
Belmont	622	1425	\$ 295,087	\$ 3,418	\$ 479.91	\$ 209.48
Bennington	75	157	\$ 42,197	\$ 1,258	\$ 579.40	\$ 276.78
Benton	19	33	\$ 6,440	\$ 103	\$ 344.40	\$ 198.29
Berlin	1156	2670	\$ 444,158	\$ 13,746	\$ 396.11	\$ 171.50
Bethlehem	164	400	\$ 85,403	\$ 2,631	\$ 536.79	\$ 220.09
Boscawen	231	614	\$ 66,557	\$ 889	\$ 291.98	\$ 109.85
Bow	64	204	\$ 21,864	\$ 2	\$ 341.65	\$ 107.19
Bradford	110	286	\$ 73,043	\$ 1,379	\$ 676.57	\$ 260.22
Brentwood	48	116	\$ 22,586	\$ 363	\$ 478.09	\$ 197.83
Bridgewater	46	92	\$ 22,235	\$ 599	\$ 496.39	\$ 248.20
Bristol	182	422	\$ 86,821	\$ 2,447	\$ 490.48	\$ 211.54
Brookfield	22	48	\$ 9,986	\$ -	\$ 453.91	\$ 208.04
Brookline	46	129	\$ 28,702	\$ 224	\$ 628.83	\$ 224.23
Campton	225	498	\$ 113,102	\$ 1,738	\$ 510.40	\$ 230.60
Canaan	145	292	\$ 57,300	\$ 995	\$ 402.04	\$ 199.64
Candia	99	237	\$ 55,966	\$ 594	\$ 571.31	\$ 238.65
Canterbury	33	70	\$ 19,436	\$ 122	\$ 592.68	\$ 279.41
Carroll	35	86	\$ 24,793	\$ 81	\$ 710.67	\$ 289.23
Center Harbor	39	93	\$ 22,548	\$ 680	\$ 595.59	\$ 249.76
Charlestown	440	1160	\$ 172,340	\$ 2,256	\$ 396.81	\$ 150.51
Chatham	14	37	\$ 9,278	\$ 265	\$ 681.67	\$ 257.93
Chester	55	156	\$ 28,272	\$ 547	\$ 523.97	\$ 184.73
Chesterfield	118	309	\$ 64,189	\$ 1,037	\$ 552.76	\$ 211.09
Chichester	59	152	\$ 15,516	\$ 152	\$ 265.55	\$ 103.08
Claremont	1295	3332	\$ 446,428	\$ 9,777	\$ 352.28	\$ 136.92

<u>TOWN</u>	<u>Number of Households</u>	<u>Number of Household Members</u>	<u>Discount Paid To Customers</u>	<u>Pre Program Arrears</u>	<u>Average Benefit per Household</u>	<u>Average Benefit per Household Member</u>
Clarksville	18	42	\$ 11,361	\$ 398	\$ 653.30	\$ 279.98
Colebrook	320	695	\$ 146,168	\$ 3,270	\$ 466.99	\$ 215.02
Columbia	72	132	\$ 34,909	\$ 223	\$ 487.95	\$ 266.15
Concord	1865	4346	\$ 445,047	\$ 7,102	\$ 242.44	\$ 104.04
Conway	813	1769	\$ 454,175	\$ 5,629	\$ 565.56	\$ 259.92
Cornish	67	136	\$ 33,661	\$ -	\$ 502.40	\$ 247.50
Croydon	39	85	\$ 17,608	\$ 155	\$ 455.46	\$ 208.98
Dalton	107	217	\$ 54,838	\$ 225	\$ 514.61	\$ 253.75
Danbury	80	198	\$ 40,598	\$ 352	\$ 511.88	\$ 206.82
Danville	137	323	\$ 54,134	\$ 1,258	\$ 404.32	\$ 171.49
Deerfield	105	270	\$ 65,265	\$ 1,065	\$ 631.71	\$ 245.67
Deering	108	329	\$ 64,476	\$ 1,604	\$ 611.85	\$ 200.85
Derry	1229	2992	\$ 631,513	\$ 17,202	\$ 527.84	\$ 216.82
Dorchester	39	83	\$ 17,291	\$ -	\$ 443.37	\$ 208.33
Dover	1472	3396	\$ 635,880	\$ 15,253	\$ 442.35	\$ 191.74
Dublin	29	78	\$ 14,710	\$ 16	\$ 507.78	\$ 188.79
Dummer	21	33	\$ 11,165	\$ -	\$ 531.66	\$ 338.33
Dunbarton	58	153	\$ 29,549	\$ 255	\$ 513.85	\$ 194.79
Durham	48	75	\$ 17,069	\$ 43	\$ 356.49	\$ 228.15
East Kingston	28	67	\$ 8,827	\$ -	\$ 315.26	\$ 131.75
Easton	11	22	\$ 6,436	\$ -	\$ 585.09	\$ 292.54
Eaton	1	1	\$ 283	\$ -	\$ 282.91	\$ 282.91
Effingham	138	355	\$ 68,485	\$ 1,394	\$ 506.37	\$ 196.84
Ellsworth	6	16	\$ 1,615	\$ -	\$ 269.17	\$ 100.94
Enfield	129	263	\$ 44,352	\$ 967	\$ 351.31	\$ 172.31
Epping	270	679	\$ 145,033	\$ 3,857	\$ 551.44	\$ 219.28
Epsom	199	475	\$ 73,593	\$ 1,813	\$ 378.92	\$ 158.75
Errol	43	70	\$ 17,981	\$ -	\$ 418.16	\$ 256.87
Exeter	594	1177	\$ 175,758	\$ 3,070	\$ 301.06	\$ 151.94
Farmington	496	1372	\$ 256,201	\$ 5,655	\$ 527.94	\$ 190.86
Fitzwilliam	113	298	\$ 58,803	\$ 1,912	\$ 537.30	\$ 203.74
Francestown	31	87	\$ 23,576	\$ 1,360	\$ 804.39	\$ 286.62
Franconia	43	87	\$ 17,940	\$ 1,012	\$ 440.73	\$ 217.83
Franklin	886	2392	\$ 379,857	\$ 8,501	\$ 438.33	\$ 162.36
Freedom	92	207	\$ 66,557	\$ 339	\$ 727.12	\$ 323.17
Fremont	105	268	\$ 59,950	\$ 1,611	\$ 586.29	\$ 229.70
Gilford	390	812	\$ 177,984	\$ 1,263	\$ 459.61	\$ 220.75
Gilmanton	164	462	\$ 76,006	\$ 527	\$ 466.66	\$ 165.66
Gilsum	47	108	\$ 22,654	\$ 470	\$ 492.00	\$ 214.11
Goffstown	440	1020	\$ 239,149	\$ 3,315	\$ 551.06	\$ 237.71
Gorham	214	409	\$ 78,959	\$ 2,343	\$ 379.91	\$ 198.78
Goshen	50	162	\$ 25,232	\$ 172	\$ 508.09	\$ 156.82
Grafton	119	293	\$ 64,786	\$ 1,209	\$ 554.58	\$ 225.24
Grantham	23	52	\$ 12,158	\$ 104	\$ 533.13	\$ 235.81
Greenfield	61	172	\$ 33,734	\$ 1,769	\$ 582.01	\$ 206.41
Greenland	60	118	\$ 32,737	\$ 714	\$ 557.52	\$ 283.48

<u>TOWN</u>	<u>Number of Households</u>	<u>Number of Household Members</u>	<u>Discount Paid To Customers</u>	<u>Pre Program Arrears</u>	<u>Average Benefit per Household</u>	<u>Average Benefit per Household Member</u>
Greenville	182	508	\$ 88,290	\$ 1,871	\$ 495.39	\$ 177.48
Groton	48	116	\$ 21,966	\$ 344	\$ 464.77	\$ 192.32
Hampstead	169	351	\$ 75,888	\$ 1,201	\$ 456.15	\$ 219.63
Hampton	319	722	\$ 96,934	\$ 2,300	\$ 311.08	\$ 137.44
Hampton Falls	15	27	\$ 3,972	\$ -	\$ 264.83	\$ 147.13
Hancock	51	125	\$ 20,557	\$ 421	\$ 411.33	\$ 167.82
Hanover	23	31	\$ 9,034	\$ -	\$ 392.76	\$ 291.40
Harrisville	37	98	\$ 23,729	\$ 14	\$ 641.70	\$ 242.28
Haverhill	180	435	\$ 89,662	\$ 1,022	\$ 503.80	\$ 208.47
Hebron	34	114	\$ 15,767	\$ -	\$ 463.74	\$ 138.31
Henniker	141	315	\$ 76,205	\$ 1,940	\$ 554.22	\$ 248.08
Hill	68	221	\$ 31,277	\$ 419	\$ 466.12	\$ 143.42
Hillsborough	437	1188	\$ 228,359	\$ 4,870	\$ 533.70	\$ 196.32
Hinsdale	306	790	\$ 171,574	\$ 4,813	\$ 576.43	\$ 223.27
Holderness	82	188	\$ 39,154	\$ 263	\$ 480.70	\$ 209.67
Hollis	67	169	\$ 37,520	\$ 622	\$ 569.28	\$ 225.69
Hooksett	497	1038	\$ 200,429	\$ 3,502	\$ 410.32	\$ 196.47
Hopkinton	136	277	\$ 57,039	\$ 1,218	\$ 428.36	\$ 210.31
Hudson	636	1750	\$ 397,900	\$ 9,240	\$ 640.16	\$ 232.65
Jackson	37	86	\$ 19,865	\$ 52	\$ 538.31	\$ 231.60
Jaffrey	270	694	\$ 145,526	\$ 4,275	\$ 554.82	\$ 215.85
Jefferson	50	93	\$ 24,407	\$ 142	\$ 490.97	\$ 263.96
Keene	1261	2747	\$ 644,047	\$ 6,601	\$ 515.98	\$ 236.86
Kensington	15	28	\$ 5,864	\$ -	\$ 390.92	\$ 209.42
Kingston	154	385	\$ 54,339	\$ 2,493	\$ 369.04	\$ 147.61
Laconia	1459	3594	\$ 535,161	\$ 11,172	\$ 374.46	\$ 152.01
Lancaster	274	631	\$ 125,728	\$ 1,333	\$ 463.73	\$ 201.37
Landaff	22	50	\$ 8,072	\$ -	\$ 366.91	\$ 161.44
Langdon	34	76	\$ 14,516	\$ 297	\$ 435.67	\$ 194.91
Lebanon	394	762	\$ 134,920	\$ 1,974	\$ 347.45	\$ 179.65
Lee	124	334	\$ 66,247	\$ 2,046	\$ 550.75	\$ 204.47
Lempster	83	228	\$ 45,086	\$ 383	\$ 547.82	\$ 199.43
Lincoln	174	334	\$ 59,957	\$ 1,157	\$ 351.23	\$ 182.98
Lisbon	148	390	\$ 62,578	\$ 2,599	\$ 440.39	\$ 167.12
Litchfield	174	515	\$ 122,344	\$ 3,035	\$ 720.57	\$ 243.45
Littleton	27	65	\$ 13,158	\$ -	\$ 487.32	\$ 202.43
Londonderry	443	1187	\$ 300,003	\$ 7,398	\$ 693.91	\$ 258.97
Loudon	197	497	\$ 100,996	\$ 1,069	\$ 518.09	\$ 205.36
Lyman	42	101	\$ 22,850	\$ 146	\$ 547.53	\$ 227.68
Lyme	22	38	\$ 8,732	\$ -	\$ 396.90	\$ 229.79
Lyndeborough	33	100	\$ 18,558	\$ 630	\$ 581.43	\$ 191.87
Madbury	46	106	\$ 33,155	\$ 314	\$ 727.59	\$ 315.74
Madison	146	443	\$ 73,550	\$ 1,293	\$ 512.62	\$ 168.95
Manchester	9144	24138	\$ 3,619,394	\$ 91,627	\$ 405.84	\$ 153.74
Marlborough	104	211	\$ 47,579	\$ 383	\$ 461.18	\$ 227.31
Marlow	59	156	\$ 27,176	\$ 198	\$ 463.96	\$ 175.47

<u>TOWN</u>	<u>Number of Households</u>	<u>Number of Household Members</u>	<u>Discount Paid To Customers</u>	<u>Pre Program Arrears</u>	<u>Average Benefit per Household</u>	<u>Average Benefit per Household Member</u>
Mason	18	65	\$ 11,531	\$ 6	\$ 640.93	\$ 177.49
Meredith	497	1221	\$ 261,969	\$ 1,985	\$ 531.09	\$ 216.18
Merrimack	420	1116	\$ 283,959	\$ 5,800	\$ 689.90	\$ 259.64
Middleton	102	289	\$ 53,923	\$ 1,181	\$ 540.23	\$ 190.67
Milan	88	183	\$ 44,253	\$ 1,327	\$ 517.96	\$ 249.07
Milford	537	1389	\$ 286,776	\$ 5,747	\$ 544.74	\$ 210.60
Millsfield	2	6	\$ 1,929	\$ -	\$ 964.32	\$ 321.44
Milton	412	1132	\$ 211,970	\$ 6,571	\$ 530.44	\$ 193.06
Monroe	33	81	\$ 13,411	\$ -	\$ 406.40	\$ 165.57
Mont Vernon	53	159	\$ 33,170	\$ 891	\$ 642.66	\$ 214.22
Moultonborough	171	459	\$ 77,761	\$ 900	\$ 460.01	\$ 171.38
Nashua	4512	12036	\$ 2,007,840	\$ 54,612	\$ 457.10	\$ 171.36
Nelson	27	60	\$ 10,701	\$ 211	\$ 404.14	\$ 181.86
New Boston	74	229	\$ 61,452	\$ 739	\$ 840.42	\$ 271.58
New Castle	5	5	\$ 1,225	\$ -	\$ 245.05	\$ 245.05
New Durham	106	292	\$ 53,413	\$ 2,118	\$ 523.88	\$ 190.17
New Hampton	117	326	\$ 67,583	\$ 714	\$ 583.74	\$ 209.50
New Ipswich	128	406	\$ 73,785	\$ 2,903	\$ 599.12	\$ 188.89
New London	53	139	\$ 24,425	\$ 298	\$ 466.47	\$ 177.86
Newbury	53	112	\$ 26,890	\$ 224	\$ 511.59	\$ 242.09
Newfields	18	32	\$ 7,233	\$ -	\$ 401.83	\$ 226.03
Newington	20	45	\$ 11,186	\$ 211	\$ 569.88	\$ 253.28
Newmarket	321	819	\$ 165,553	\$ 6,036	\$ 534.55	\$ 209.51
Newport	796	1880	\$ 403,548	\$ 4,963	\$ 513.20	\$ 217.29
Newton	93	229	\$ 35,660	\$ 1,878	\$ 403.64	\$ 163.92
North Hampton	92	179	\$ 64,931	\$ -	\$ 705.77	\$ 362.74
Northfield	269	626	\$ 140,781	\$ 1,742	\$ 529.83	\$ 227.67
Northumberland	246	538	\$ 109,722	\$ 2,898	\$ 457.81	\$ 209.33
Northwood	183	500	\$ 99,987	\$ 2,492	\$ 560.00	\$ 204.96
Nottingham	88	216	\$ 36,398	\$ 3,167	\$ 449.60	\$ 183.17
Orange	1	6	\$ 1,218	\$ -	\$ 1,217.56	\$ 202.93
Orford	27	63	\$ 15,445	\$ -	\$ 572.02	\$ 245.15
Ossipee	486	1128	\$ 269,874	\$ 4,664	\$ 564.89	\$ 243.38
Pelham	203	508	\$ 115,236	\$ 1,643	\$ 575.76	\$ 230.08
Pembroke	392	945	\$ 158,263	\$ 3,814	\$ 413.46	\$ 171.51
Peterborough	228	583	\$ 94,938	\$ 2,798	\$ 428.67	\$ 167.64
Piermont	38	83	\$ 16,183	\$ -	\$ 425.88	\$ 194.98
Pittsburg	77	160	\$ 28,919	\$ 1,731	\$ 398.04	\$ 191.56
Pittsfield	291	768	\$ 128,615	\$ 3,076	\$ 452.55	\$ 171.47
Plainfield	46	94	\$ 19,956	\$ -	\$ 433.82	\$ 212.30
Plaistow	173	401	\$ 49,715	\$ 1,449	\$ 295.74	\$ 127.59
Plymouth	274	681	\$ 138,801	\$ 1,914	\$ 513.56	\$ 206.63
Portsmouth	664	1309	\$ 278,273	\$ 4,227	\$ 425.45	\$ 215.81
Randolph	12	23	\$ 4,519	\$ -	\$ 376.60	\$ 196.49
Raymond	557	1356	\$ 291,208	\$ 7,587	\$ 536.44	\$ 220.35
Richmond	39	125	\$ 20,172	\$ 251	\$ 523.64	\$ 163.38

<u>TOWN</u>	<u>Number of Households</u>	<u>Number of Household Members</u>	<u>Discount Paid To Customers</u>	<u>Pre Program Arrears</u>	<u>Average Benefit per Household</u>	<u>Average Benefit per Household Member</u>
Rindge	128	421	\$ 72,430	\$ 1,532	\$ 577.83	\$ 175.68
Rochester	2674	6200	\$ 1,233,432	\$ 29,377	\$ 472.25	\$ 203.68
Rollinsford	98	234	\$ 48,721	\$ 1,475	\$ 512.21	\$ 214.51
Roxbury	11	30	\$ 8,340	\$ -	\$ 758.16	\$ 277.99
Rumney	139	356	\$ 70,232	\$ 1,031	\$ 512.68	\$ 200.18
Rye	92	157	\$ 42,535	\$ 519	\$ 467.98	\$ 274.23
Salem	751	1493	\$ 227,333	\$ 7,182	\$ 312.27	\$ 157.08
Salisbury	46	106	\$ 12,701	\$ 630	\$ 289.79	\$ 125.76
Sanbornton	96	265	\$ 50,220	\$ 645	\$ 529.84	\$ 191.94
Sandown	108	279	\$ 62,996	\$ 593	\$ 588.78	\$ 227.92
Sandwich	52	86	\$ 23,501	\$ 474	\$ 461.06	\$ 278.78
Seabrook	613	1350	\$ 212,497	\$ 3,876	\$ 352.97	\$ 160.28
Sharon	5	22	\$ 878	\$ 125	\$ 200.66	\$ 45.60
Shelburne	8	20	\$ 3,139	\$ 366	\$ 438.13	\$ 175.25
Somersworth	943	2439	\$ 446,620	\$ 11,413	\$ 485.72	\$ 187.80
South Hampton	10	13	\$ 2,113	\$ -	\$ 211.33	\$ 162.56
Springfield	48	124	\$ 22,221	\$ 1,068	\$ 485.20	\$ 187.82
Stark	41	74	\$ 19,206	\$ 109	\$ 471.08	\$ 261.00
Stewartstown	108	237	\$ 55,885	\$ 236	\$ 519.65	\$ 236.80
Stoddard	30	61	\$ 15,962	\$ 351	\$ 543.76	\$ 267.42
Strafford	89	236	\$ 41,847	\$ 979	\$ 481.20	\$ 181.47
Stratford	174	382	\$ 83,246	\$ 837	\$ 483.24	\$ 220.11
Stratham	55	151	\$ 22,506	\$ 361	\$ 415.78	\$ 151.44
Sugar Hill	18	37	\$ 8,726	\$ 1	\$ 484.85	\$ 235.87
Sullivan	59	155	\$ 37,629	\$ 125	\$ 639.90	\$ 243.57
Sunapee	117	298	\$ 62,364	\$ 1,248	\$ 543.69	\$ 213.46
Surry	32	94	\$ 17,947	\$ 37	\$ 561.98	\$ 191.31
Sutton	63	148	\$ 31,899	\$ 971	\$ 521.76	\$ 222.10
Swanzy	444	1119	\$ 231,275	\$ 3,800	\$ 529.45	\$ 210.08
Tamworth	288	590	\$ 150,636	\$ 2,233	\$ 530.79	\$ 259.10
Temple	38	111	\$ 21,005	\$ 435	\$ 564.20	\$ 193.15
Thornton	122	268	\$ 68,890	\$ 916	\$ 572.18	\$ 260.47
Tilton	283	596	\$ 137,614	\$ 2,762	\$ 496.03	\$ 235.53
Troy	220	620	\$ 98,501	\$ 2,888	\$ 460.86	\$ 163.53
Tuftsboro	103	264	\$ 46,191	\$ 246	\$ 450.85	\$ 175.90
Unity	56	126	\$ 30,416	\$ 717	\$ 555.94	\$ 247.08
Unknown	11	27	\$ 4,162.45	\$ -	\$ 378.40	\$ 154.16
Wakefield	376	980	\$ 207,987	\$ 4,176	\$ 564.26	\$ 216.49
Walpole	117	316	\$ 35,650	\$ 323	\$ 307.46	\$ 113.84
Warner	116	296	\$ 74,913	\$ 546	\$ 650.51	\$ 254.93
Warren	85	187	\$ 40,163	\$ 186	\$ 474.70	\$ 215.77
Washington	56	174	\$ 36,172	\$ 209	\$ 649.67	\$ 209.09

<u>TOWN</u>	Number of <u>Households</u>	Number of Household <u>Members</u>	Discount Paid <u>To Customers</u>	Pre Program <u>Arrears</u>	Average Benefit per <u>Household</u>	Average Benefit per <u>Household Member</u>
Weare	260	747	\$ 153,964	\$ 5,338	\$ 612.70	\$ 213.26
Webster	51	143	\$ 23,165	\$ 186	\$ 457.85	\$ 163.29
Wentworth	66	163	\$ 30,024	\$ 239	\$ 458.52	\$ 185.66
Wentworths Loca	1	2	\$ 65	\$ -	\$ 64.87	\$ 32.44
Westmoreland	39	115	\$ 22,794	\$ 433	\$ 595.56	\$ 201.97
Whitefield	178	406	\$ 89,096	\$ 1,326	\$ 507.99	\$ 222.71
Wilmot	47	104	\$ 21,438	\$ 84	\$ 457.91	\$ 206.94
Wilton	159	411	\$ 73,212	\$ 2,553	\$ 476.51	\$ 184.34
Winchester	530	1350	\$ 314,580	\$ 5,983	\$ 604.83	\$ 237.45
Windham	98	271	\$ 57,059	\$ 1,336	\$ 595.87	\$ 215.48
Windsor	17	56	\$ 10,989	\$ -	\$ 646.39	\$ 196.23
Wolfeboro	8	17	\$ 2,324	\$ -	\$ 290.46	\$ 136.69
<u>Woodstock</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>236</u>	<u>\$ 46,131</u>	<u>\$ 828</u>	<u>\$ 423.06</u>	<u>\$ 198.98</u>
TOTAL	61153	150564	\$ 27,720,881	\$ 585,336	\$ 462.88	\$ 188.00

ELECTRIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (Revised 10-10-05)
FOR HOUSEHOLDS ENROLLED SINCE PROGRAM INCEPTION
OCTOBER 2002 THRU AUGUST 2005

----- Number of Households Benefitting from EAP by Income Level -----									
	UNDER	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$6,000	\$8,000	\$10,000	\$12,000	\$15,000	
	<u>\$2,000</u>	<u>\$3,999</u>	<u>\$5,999</u>	<u>\$7,999</u>	<u>\$9,999</u>	<u>\$11,999</u>	<u>\$14,999</u>	<u>&OVER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Acworth	1	6	1	11	6	13	10	25	73
Albany	0	0	3	9	13	9	15	27	76
Alexandria	4	0	2	5	11	10	5	39	76
Allenstown	17	6	18	58	47	58	61	182	447
Alstead	3	5	6	17	9	27	13	64	144
Alton	10	0	7	24	27	28	45	93	234
Amherst	6	8	4	17	18	14	20	62	149
Andover	3	3	4	12	8	12	14	45	101
Antrim	9	2	2	34	25	30	30	83	215
Ashland	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	8
Atkinson	3	0	1	3	9	5	9	29	59
Auburn	11	3	4	9	8	4	14	36	89
Barnstead	12	0	3	16	28	13	25	80	177
Barrington	17	6	14	49	37	21	50	112	306
Bartlett	3	5	1	18	20	14	16	67	144
Bath	2	0	10	10	5	12	11	25	75
Bedford	7	3	4	27	16	28	25	54	164
Belmont	20	10	9	95	78	69	104	237	622
Bennington	2	4	0	17	5	12	11	24	75
Benton	0	1	0	4	1	4	2	7	19
Berlin	35	26	50	188	127	154	198	378	1156
Bethlehem	10	2	5	15	23	7	23	79	164
Boscawen	10	9	7	28	24	32	31	90	231
Bow	5	2	1	3	5	6	8	34	64
Bradford	3	0	3	10	15	20	15	44	110
Brentwood	3	0	0	6	4	4	8	23	48
Bridgewater	0	1	0	7	11	9	4	14	46
Bristol	12	6	4	32	17	23	20	68	182
Brookfield	1	0	0	3	2	4	1	11	22
Brookline	6	1	5	6	4	0	3	21	46
Campton	17	2	1	24	29	28	39	85	225
Canaan	9	3	3	29	17	22	17	45	145
Candia	6	0	2	10	11	11	15	44	99
Canterbury	7	1	0	6	2	6	4	7	33
Carroll	0	0	2	1	9	4	3	16	35
Center Harbor	4	0	1	7	6	6	4	11	39
Charlestown	27	4	8	41	53	59	52	196	440
Chatham	0	0	0	6	2	1	2	3	14
Chester	3	1	4	7	5	6	13	16	55
Chesterfield	3	0	2	24	7	14	19	49	118
Chichester	1	0	1	8	0	11	9	29	59
Claremont	55	22	29	204	109	118	182	576	1295

----- Number of Households Benefitting from EAP by Income Level -----

	UNDER \$2,000	\$2,000 \$3,999	\$4,000 \$5,999	\$6,000 \$7,999	\$8,000 \$9,999	\$10,000 \$11,999	\$12,000 \$14,999	\$15,000 &OVER	TOTAL
Clarksville	3	1	2	2	1	2	0	7	18
Colebrook	8	4	8	52	48	64	42	94	320
Columbia	0	0	6	16	5	13	14	18	72
Concord	90	46	42	255	197	239	318	678	1865
Conway	37	15	29	137	107	111	118	259	813
Cornish	7	2	2	5	13	4	6	28	67
Croydon	1	0	0	2	6	3	10	17	39
Dalton	0	0	3	12	10	23	16	43	107
Danbury	2	0	6	15	9	14	12	22	80
Danville	9	3	4	27	8	20	24	42	137
Deerfield	4	5	7	13	6	13	13	44	105
Deering	5	2	2	4	11	8	15	61	108
Derry	87	16	40	168	137	142	177	462	1229
Dorchester	0	2	1	7	1	10	6	12	39
Dover	89	37	64	296	165	153	216	452	1472
Dublin	1	0	2	4	4	2	6	10	29
Dummer	1	0	0	3	4	2	5	6	21
Dunbarton	2	2	0	5	4	4	17	24	58
Durham	3	0	0	8	11	7	9	10	48
East Kingston	1	0	1	7	3	4	5	7	28
Easton	2	0	0	6	0	0	0	3	11
Eaton	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Effingham	7	2	3	12	12	21	24	57	138
Ellsworth	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	6
Enfield	9	3	2	16	32	14	13	40	129
Epping	8	7	12	47	27	26	43	100	270
Epsom	10	0	5	26	27	30	21	80	199
Errol	0	0	2	9	7	7	7	11	43
Exeter	39	6	19	96	94	64	89	187	594
Farmington	40	8	9	52	58	47	75	207	496
Fitzwilliam	8	1	4	12	17	6	14	51	113
Francestown	3	3	2	0	1	3	7	12	31
Franconia	1	0	5	2	4	7	1	23	43
Franklin	49	17	21	147	103	114	115	320	886
Freedom	5	0	0	15	11	13	9	39	92
Fremont	5	2	2	13	7	12	14	50	105
Gilford	10	1	11	44	62	45	85	132	390
Gilmanton	8	1	6	11	12	21	32	73	164
Gilsum	4	0	2	6	7	3	7	18	47
Goffstown	22	9	11	49	57	62	74	156	440
Gorham	1	2	8	29	25	42	31	76	214
Goshen	7	0	0	6	6	3	3	25	50
Grafton	5	1	7	19	13	13	12	49	119
Grantham	1	1	0	2	1	3	3	12	23
Greenfield	7	0	0	1	2	12	5	34	61
Greenland	1	1	1	16	5	5	16	15	60

----- Number of Households Benefitting from EAP by Income Level -----

	UNDER \$2,000	\$2,000 \$3,999	\$4,000 \$5,999	\$6,000 \$7,999	\$8,000 \$9,999	\$10,000 \$11,999	\$12,000 \$14,999	\$15,000 &OVER	TOTAL
Greenville	7	2	5	17	10	25	33	83	182
Groton	0	0	0	8	7	1	9	23	48
Hampstead	7	3	2	8	26	16	37	70	169
Hampton	16	17	12	51	35	37	54	97	319
Hampton Falls	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	15
Hancock	2	1	0	6	6	3	18	15	51
Hanover	1	0	0	2	5	7	5	3	23
Harrisville	3	0	0	4	4	7	4	15	37
Haverhill	5	4	6	16	30	27	25	67	180
Hebron	0	1	0	4	4	6	6	13	34
Henniker	6	2	3	21	12	21	16	60	141
Hill	0	0	3	5	9	6	9	36	68
Hillsborough	16	9	11	40	41	49	68	203	437
Hinsdale	13	0	4	35	42	48	34	130	306
Holderness	0	0	3	5	12	10	15	37	82
Hollis	4	0	3	9	9	9	7	26	67
Hooksett	24	5	16	74	75	62	93	148	497
Hopkinton	10	1	4	13	27	18	18	45	136
Hudson	36	22	30	71	57	61	101	258	636
Jackson	1	0	5	4	5	5	6	11	37
Jaffrey	14	3	9	17	29	40	51	107	270
Jefferson	0	1	2	7	9	10	6	15	50
Keene	62	9	35	190	135	145	207	478	1261
Kensington	0	0	2	2	2	0	4	5	15
Kingston	11	3	7	21	7	19	26	60	154
Laconia	74	24	43	225	185	190	216	502	1459
Lancaster	5	3	9	38	30	34	38	117	274
Landaff	0	0	2	3	3	6	3	5	22
Langdon	1	0	0	1	5	2	7	18	34
Lebanon	24	6	9	94	63	48	55	95	394
Lee	4	4	7	6	12	16	14	61	124
Lempster	3	3	0	15	7	7	18	30	83
Lincoln	5	2	3	19	32	31	28	54	174
Lisbon	5	0	3	19	23	22	18	58	148
Litchfield	10	5	11	22	12	17	12	85	174
Littleton	5	0	0	9	1	3	6	3	27
Londonderry	31	9	14	39	30	62	67	191	443
Loudon	11	5	1	22	33	9	29	87	197
Lyman	0	0	7	3	7	5	3	17	42
Lyme	0	0	0	3	6	8	2	3	22
Lyndeborough	1	0	0	5	3	0	6	18	33
Madbury	0	0	2	6	10	10	0	18	46
Madison	4	1	3	17	9	16	16	80	146
Manchester	632	145	281	1472	903	1009	1404	3298	9144
Marlborough	3	2	0	14	20	9	18	38	104
Marlow	4	0	0	8	4	3	15	25	59

----- Number of Households Benefitting from EAP by Income Level -----

	UNDER \$2,000	\$2,000 \$3,999	\$4,000 \$5,999	\$6,000 \$7,999	\$8,000 \$9,999	\$10,000 \$11,999	\$12,000 \$14,999	\$15,000 &OVER	TOTAL
Mason	3	2	0	0	2	1	3	7	18
Meredith	29	9	14	60	65	45	55	220	497
Merrimack	24	8	11	31	32	64	70	180	420
Middleton	3	3	1	13	8	18	11	45	102
Milan	1	0	2	6	14	18	13	34	88
Milford	34	13	13	89	34	50	80	224	537
Millsfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Milton	21	3	5	60	42	57	64	160	412
Monroe	1	0	0	3	6	6	5	12	33
Mont Vernon	1	0	3	6	6	4	7	26	53
Moultonborough	4	1	3	15	11	22	30	85	171
Nashua	313	126	149	764	440	416	707	1597	4512
Nelson	0	3	0	2	8	4	6	4	27
New Boston	13	0	5	4	10	3	9	30	74
New Castle	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	5
New Durham	8	1	6	8	6	16	3	58	106
New Hampton	3	2	3	9	14	7	26	53	117
New Ipswich	6	4	2	11	17	11	21	56	128
New London	0	0	2	9	2	14	8	18	53
Newbury	5	1	7	2	13	5	5	15	53
Newfields	1	0	0	3	0	1	3	10	18
Newington	0	3	0	3	4	2	0	8	20
Newmarket	36	6	17	34	39	25	55	109	321
Newport	24	13	33	127	93	120	119	267	796
Newton	10	0	1	11	18	12	13	28	93
North Hampton	1	6	2	12	19	13	14	25	92
Northfield	4	1	8	52	27	34	40	103	269
Northumberland	2	1	3	23	24	43	41	109	246
Northwood	15	4	4	27	11	20	30	72	183
Nottingham	4	0	4	7	5	15	14	39	88
Orange	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orford	1	1	1	4	7	0	5	8	27
Ossipee	13	11	30	83	69	67	66	147	486
Pelham	14	2	7	20	22	22	30	86	203
Pembroke	13	14	25	44	47	48	55	146	392
Peterborough	24	3	12	15	24	32	28	90	228
Piermont	2	0	1	4	4	7	6	14	38
Pittsburg	6	0	1	6	16	13	8	27	77
Pittsfield	12	1	6	35	37	30	57	113	291
Plainfield	3	0	2	14	7	1	10	9	46
Plaistow	9	1	5	29	13	13	35	68	173
Plymouth	5	8	4	41	29	39	46	102	274
Portsmouth	51	6	21	111	84	100	102	189	664
Randolph	0	0	1	1	5	2	0	3	12
Raymond	31	11	9	76	66	60	105	199	557
Richmond	0	0	3	5	2	0	1	28	39

----- Number of Households Benefitting from EAP by Income Level -----

	UNDER \$2,000	\$2,000 \$3,999	\$4,000 \$5,999	\$6,000 \$7,999	\$8,000 \$9,999	\$10,000 \$11,999	\$12,000 \$14,999	\$15,000 &OVER	TOTAL
Rindge	1	0	0	19	4	22	17	65	128
Rochester	168	44	74	497	313	358	433	787	2674
Rollinsford	1	2	5	16	14	10	17	33	98
Roxbury	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	6	11
Rumney	8	3	3	16	22	7	32	48	139
Rye	3	0	2	16	8	14	26	23	92
Salem	60	5	5	101	93	115	150	222	751
Salisbury	1	1	2	4	5	7	12	14	46
Sanbornton	4	0	2	7	9	17	12	45	96
Sandown	10	0	3	12	9	3	17	54	108
Sandwich	1	2	1	15	9	10	2	12	52
Seabrook	49	4	32	99	89	73	125	142	613
Sharon	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5
Shelburne	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	8
Somersworth	52	19	37	201	86	114	140	294	943
South Hampton	0	0	1	1	1	0	4	3	10
Springfield	2	0	1	8	5	6	6	20	48
Stark	0	0	1	10	7	9	5	9	41
Stewartstown	8	2	0	22	16	9	15	36	108
Stoddard	1	0	0	4	6	9	2	8	30
Strafford	2	0	1	9	23	15	7	32	89
Stratford	7	0	3	30	20	29	26	59	174
Stratham	2	0	1	8	6	6	17	15	55
Sugar Hill	0	1	1	5	0	4	0	7	18
Sullivan	2	1	1	3	6	6	5	35	59
Sunapee	8	1	4	10	9	18	15	52	117
Surry	3	0	0	8	3	10	2	6	32
Sutton	0	0	5	9	5	9	10	25	63
Swanzey	13	8	6	70	47	46	66	188	444
Tamworth	8	4	8	58	35	48	34	93	288
Temple	1	2	0	4	4	4	2	21	38
Thornton	4	6	7	21	7	8	24	45	122
Tilton	26	7	6	29	33	37	42	103	283
Troy	10	1	7	21	20	21	29	111	220
Tuftonboro	3	0	0	18	15	3	16	48	103
Unity	3	0	0	5	12	8	11	17	56
Unknown	1	0	1	4	2	0	0	3	11
Wakefield	11	6	10	59	42	34	49	165	376
Walpole	3	1	5	18	9	15	20	46	117
Warner	8	4	1	16	11	16	13	47	116
Warren	5	1	3	15	10	10	17	24	85
Washington	0	0	3	8	1	6	5	33	56

----- Number of Households Benefitting from EAP by Income Level -----									
	UNDER	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$6,000	\$8,000	\$10,000	\$12,000	\$15,000	
	<u>\$2,000</u>	<u>\$3,999</u>	<u>\$5,999</u>	<u>\$7,999</u>	<u>\$9,999</u>	<u>\$11,999</u>	<u>\$14,999</u>	<u>&OVER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Weare	17	2	7	22	24	36	28	124	260
Webster	3	1	0	7	7	2	1	30	51
Wentworth	2	0	4	7	9	14	8	22	66
Wentworths Loc:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Westmoreland	1	0	0	2	4	6	7	19	39
Whitefield	3	2	5	27	17	36	32	56	178
Wilmot	0	0	0	8	5	8	13	13	47
Wilton	1	7	6	18	15	20	21	71	159
Winchester	29	10	15	75	55	54	74	218	530
Windham	7	0	0	4	13	12	14	48	98
Windsor	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	9	17
Wolfeboro	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	8
<u>Woodstock</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>111</u>
Total	13319	31045	51832	78988	96772	117312	144356	97499	61153

ELECTRIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (Revised 10-10-05)
FOR HOUSEHOLDS ENROLLED SINCE PROGRAM INCEPTION
OCTOBER 2002 THRU AUGUST 2005

Number of **Households** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Acworth	17	16	23	12	4	1	73
Albany	11	31	10	19	4	1	76
Alexandria	11	9	25	24	3	4	76
Allenstown	101	95	100	98	45	8	447
Alstead	36	30	35	30	8	5	144
Alton	56	41	50	60	23	4	234
Amherst	36	34	28	25	19	7	149
Andover	24	15	17	25	16	4	101
Antrim	46	48	59	43	14	5	215
Ashland	3	1	2	2	0	0	8
Atkinson	8	10	15	18	6	2	59
Auburn	15	15	30	16	12	1	89
Barnstead	43	33	46	33	15	7	177
Barrington	80	67	74	47	26	12	306
Bartlett	25	32	35	31	15	6	144
Bath	24	11	19	14	6	1	75
Bedford	40	22	42	32	19	9	164
Belmont	144	130	143	128	63	14	622
Bennington	24	16	10	17	7	1	75
Benton	1	4	8	4	2	0	19
Berlin	273	300	267	221	75	20	1156
Bethlehem	26	40	31	38	22	7	164
Boscawen	56	47	60	43	17	8	231
Bow	13	11	20	12	5	3	64
Bradford	30	29	15	24	8	4	110
Brentwood	10	9	10	12	5	2	48
Bridgewater	4	15	15	10	1	1	46
Bristol	39	41	47	42	11	2	182
Brookfield	1	5	8	6	2	0	22
Brookline	18	8	5	8	6	1	46
Campton	35	54	62	47	22	5	225
Canaan	25	50	20	41	8	1	145
Candia	17	18	23	27	10	4	99
Canterbury	13	2	8	6	4	0	33
Carroll	6	9	9	8	3	0	35
Center Harbor	19	7	4	5	3	1	39
Charlestown	98	81	94	119	40	8	440
Chatham	4	7	1	2	0	0	14
Chester	17	13	9	11	4	1	55
Chesterfield	22	36	16	29	12	3	118

Number of **Households** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Chichester	10	16	15	11	7	0	59
Claremont	290	329	301	248	93	34	1295
Clarksville	5	3	2	5	3	0	18
Colebrook	74	87	85	60	12	2	320
Columbia	14	25	9	15	7	2	72
Concord	468	373	403	401	158	62	1865
Conway	178	214	175	167	58	21	813
Cornish	13	17	13	13	4	7	67
Croydon	7	10	10	8	2	2	39
Dalton	8	33	36	22	4	4	107
Danbury	20	19	21	14	6	0	80
Danville	36	33	20	32	13	3	137
Deerfield	36	20	23	16	7	3	105
Deering	28	10	27	26	11	6	108
Derry	293	264	259	275	110	28	1229
Dorchester	3	13	10	10	3	0	39
Dover	447	361	306	244	83	31	1472
Dublin	6	6	6	7	3	1	29
Dummer	3	5	5	6	2	0	21
Dunbarton	13	9	22	11	3	0	58
Durham	6	11	21	6	3	1	48
East Kingston	10	6	9	2	1	0	28
Easton	7	1	1	2	0	0	11
Eaton	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Effingham	34	24	26	42	9	3	138
Ellsworth	0	1	1	3	1	0	6
Enfield	17	29	42	35	3	3	129
Epping	68	62	48	64	25	3	270
Epsom	39	46	47	43	18	6	199
Errol	6	15	14	5	2	1	43
Exeter	141	135	113	139	53	13	594
Farmington	148	111	95	90	41	11	496
Fitzwilliam	27	24	17	24	14	7	113
Francestown	8	1	8	11	2	1	31
Franconia	7	6	10	11	8	1	43
Franklin	263	204	197	160	47	15	886
Freedom	16	20	20	23	9	4	92
Fremont	22	18	21	29	14	1	105
Gilford	68	83	80	121	30	8	390
Gilmanton	31	29	55	34	12	3	164
Gilsum	15	8	8	10	4	2	47
Goffstown	104	82	96	94	48	16	440
Gorham	26	57	51	59	15	6	214
Goshen	10	8	11	13	6	2	50
Grafton	36	31	25	18	6	3	119
Grantham	3	7	3	6	4	0	23

Number of **Households** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Greenfield	14	12	11	17	5	2	61
Greenland	14	17	10	15	4	0	60
Greenville	37	28	63	37	13	4	182
Groton	7	10	13	9	7	2	48
Hampstead	23	37	28	55	16	10	169
Hampton	100	68	74	48	23	6	319
Hampton Falls	4	2	2	4	3	0	15
Hancock	12	6	14	15	3	1	51
Hanover	1	3	13	5	1	0	23
Harrisville	7	11	8	8	3	0	37
Haverhill	27	46	40	53	10	4	180
Hebron	7	8	12	6	1	0	34
Henniker	33	25	32	27	21	3	141
Hill	11	8	21	21	5	2	68
Hillsborough	99	97	103	88	38	12	437
Hinsdale	60	67	73	74	24	8	306
Holderness	10	18	26	20	6	2	82
Hollis	16	11	15	14	9	2	67
Hooksett	110	94	122	123	42	6	497
Hopkinton	30	24	35	26	15	6	136
Hudson	195	125	117	121	52	26	636
Jackson	9	10	7	8	3	0	37
Jaffrey	55	57	67	63	20	8	270
Jefferson	7	10	18	10	5	0	50
Keene	240	292	283	292	103	51	1261
Kensington	2	3	3	6	1	0	15
Kingston	40	35	34	26	17	2	154
Laconia	402	361	338	250	87	21	1459
Lancaster	44	76	70	65	17	2	274
Landaff	2	8	4	6	2	0	22
Langdon	2	8	13	5	4	2	34
Lebanon	79	143	89	51	24	8	394
Lee	30	24	24	35	9	2	124
Lempster	27	17	22	14	2	1	83
Lincoln	23	45	53	37	13	3	174
Lisbon	30	31	38	36	11	2	148
Litchfield	52	29	38	35	16	4	174
Littleton	9	4	6	5	3	0	27
Londonderry	111	82	102	92	39	17	443
Loudon	37	51	36	40	23	10	197
Lyman	10	13	11	6	2	0	42
Lyme	2	2	12	5	1	0	22
Lyndeborough	9	5	4	10	3	2	33
Madbury	13	8	7	13	5	0	46
Madison	36	25	23	38	20	4	146
Manchester	2782	2081	1790	1631	642	218	9144

Number of **Households** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Marlborough	18	30	21	19	11	5	104
Marlow	13	8	15	15	6	2	59
Mason	8	0	6	4	0	0	18
Meredith	127	93	117	97	49	14	497
Merrimack	111	71	96	87	37	18	420
Middleton	19	27	25	22	6	3	102
Milan	10	14	27	24	13	0	88
Milford	144	114	115	103	45	16	537
Millsfield	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Milton	99	98	111	72	21	11	412
Monroe	4	8	9	10	2	0	33
Mont Vernon	12	8	15	12	3	3	53
Moultonborough	29	30	33	53	22	4	171
Nashua	1550	1001	812	733	310	106	4512
Nelson	4	10	10	1	1	1	27
New Boston	30	7	11	17	8	1	74
New Castle	0	0	3	1	0	1	5
New Durham	23	18	26	24	13	2	106
New Hampton	31	26	22	28	8	2	117
New Ipswich	32	25	29	30	6	6	128
New London	7	13	15	11	7	0	53
Newbury	12	14	8	14	4	1	53
Newfields	3	4	1	4	5	1	18
Newington	6	4	3	4	1	2	20
Newmarket	103	59	52	70	28	9	321
Newport	201	195	201	130	56	13	796
Newton	20	20	19	20	11	3	93
North Hampton	21	22	23	20	3	3	92
Northfield	62	71	52	58	19	7	269
Northumberland	25	59	61	72	24	5	246
Northwood	48	41	35	41	15	3	183
Nottingham	14	12	19	32	7	4	88
Orange	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orford	6	8	5	7	1	0	27
Ossipee	131	124	111	78	33	9	486
Pelham	52	38	56	30	21	6	203
Pembroke	104	64	93	92	28	11	392
Peterborough	68	43	51	36	22	8	228
Piermont	9	3	12	11	3	0	38
Pittsburg	17	16	20	16	5	3	77
Pittsfield	69	71	60	58	27	6	291
Plainfield	13	11	11	8	2	1	46
Plaistow	38	33	36	46	14	6	173
Plymouth	61	74	60	50	26	3	274
Portsmouth	138	168	166	129	52	11	664
Randolph	2	3	5	2	0	0	12

Number of **Households** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Raymond	134	115	131	114	52	11	557
Richmond	6	7	6	13	6	1	39
Rindge	33	29	27	24	12	3	128
Rochester	818	669	537	444	166	40	2674
Rollinsford	27	25	23	10	7	6	98
Roxbury	3	3	2	2	1	0	11
Rumney	35	33	38	18	14	1	139
Rye	12	21	24	23	9	3	92
Salem	125	161	211	170	68	16	751
Salisbury	10	8	12	14	1	1	46
Sanbornton	17	19	25	23	11	1	96
Sandown	19	22	33	17	14	3	108
Sandwich	10	14	13	11	4	0	52
Seabrook	162	149	148	100	38	16	613
Sharon	0	2	1	0	2	0	5
Shelburne	1	2	0	3	1	1	8
Somersworth	340	207	177	148	48	23	943
South Hampton	2	0	1	6	1	0	10
Springfield	11	14	11	8	4	0	48
Stark	8	12	12	5	4	0	41
Stewartstown	28	23	23	19	11	4	108
Stoddard	3	10	9	4	2	2	30
Strafford	26	17	20	10	13	3	89
Stratford	35	45	54	31	8	1	174
Stratham	19	15	6	10	4	1	55
Sugar Hill	7	1	4	4	1	1	18
Sullivan	13	11	12	14	8	1	59
Sunapee	29	19	24	34	7	4	117
Surry	13	10	2	3	3	1	32
Sutton	11	14	19	14	5	0	63
Swanzey	101	87	99	103	43	11	444
Tamworth	43	91	85	48	15	6	288
Temple	10	7	7	7	7	0	38
Thornton	26	32	31	15	17	1	122
Tilton	70	51	63	65	25	9	283
Troy	43	46	51	50	26	4	220
Tuftsboro	16	27	22	24	12	2	103
Unity	11	12	15	11	6	1	56
Unknown	6	4	0	1	0	0	11
Wakefield	69	104	75	77	36	15	376
Walpole	31	14	30	26	9	7	117
Warner	22	22	33	24	10	5	116
Warren	16	24	17	24	2	2	85
Washington	12	11	17	12	2	2	56

Number of **Households** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Weare	72	47	60	49	26	6	260
Webster	3	9	8	21	8	2	51
Wentworth	10	19	21	10	5	1	66
Wentworths Loc	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Westmoreland	5	11	8	11	4	0	39
Whitefield	24	51	49	41	11	2	178
Wilmot	12	13	8	7	6	1	47
Wilton	31	42	35	34	13	4	159
Winchester	131	115	113	107	52	12	530
Windham	16	14	30	25	8	5	98
Windsor	1	2	8	1	4	1	17
Wolfeboro	0	1	3	3	1	0	8
<u>Woodstock</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>111</u>
TOTAL	15656	13765	13395	12107	4767	1495	61153

ELECTRIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (Revised 10-10-05)
FOR HOUSEHOLDS ENROLLED SINCE PROGRAM INCEPTION
OCTOBER 2002 THRU AUGUST 2005

Number of **Households Members** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Acworth	35	32	51	37	7	4	166
Albany	27	65	29	53	13	1	188
Alexandria	20	19	69	60	9	11	188
Allenstown	239	210	246	253	102	18	1068
Alstead	96	89	97	59	18	11	370
Alton	158	122	113	138	52	10	593
Amherst	121	71	67	67	58	17	401
Andover	72	28	29	73	36	10	248
Antrim	140	99	129	90	52	16	526
Ashland	9	5	3	4	0	0	21
Atkinson	19	26	25	46	12	2	130
Auburn	49	37	84	43	34	2	249
Barnstead	106	88	109	95	53	16	467
Barrington	196	143	141	111	69	27	687
Bartlett	58	71	80	64	41	16	330
Bath	52	22	25	37	17	4	157
Bedford	134	35	61	57	42	15	344
Belmont	366	280	285	288	168	38	1425
Bennington	48	38	15	33	20	3	157
Benton	3	4	15	8	3	0	33
Berlin	767	662	535	490	162	54	2670
Bethlehem	58	91	71	98	63	19	400
Boscawen	159	153	138	92	45	27	614
Bow	44	35	56	37	22	10	204
Bradford	83	64	41	67	21	10	286
Brentwood	28	22	18	32	11	5	116
Bridgewater	12	26	28	21	1	4	92
Bristol	80	65	132	107	34	4	422
Brookfield	2	9	17	12	8	0	48
Brookline	45	19	14	28	19	4	129
Campton	99	86	133	113	55	12	498
Canaan	49	78	57	85	22	1	292
Candia	37	44	50	63	30	13	237
Canterbury	30	6	12	12	10	0	70
Carroll	19	17	24	20	6	0	86
Center Harbor	41	18	14	11	4	5	93
Charlestown	282	200	244	303	107	24	1160
Chatham	11	14	2	10	0	0	37
Chester	53	39	34	24	4	2	156
Chesterfield	56	95	43	67	37	11	309

Number of **Household Members** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Chichester	32	46	34	26	14	0	152
Claremont	797	755	770	681	237	92	3332
Clarksville	8	8	2	12	12	0	42
Colebrook	191	178	171	121	24	10	695
Columbia	32	38	16	23	21	2	132
Concord	1250	754	829	947	396	170	4346
Conway	425	396	360	390	155	43	1769
Cornish	25	32	30	28	8	13	136
Croydon	22	20	18	14	7	4	85
Dalton	19	67	70	45	7	9	217
Danbury	58	41	46	38	15	0	198
Danville	82	63	46	88	36	8	323
Deerfield	91	43	62	42	24	8	270
Deering	86	38	83	82	29	11	329
Derry	773	565	596	688	299	71	2992
Dorchester	4	19	23	29	8	0	83
Dover	1157	739	686	558	188	68	3396
Dublin	14	16	10	28	8	2	78
Dummer	5	5	10	10	3	0	33
Dunbarton	36	26	51	26	14	0	153
Durham	11	14	36	9	3	2	75
East Kingston	27	12	23	2	3	0	67
Easton	12	1	4	5	0	0	22
Eaton	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Effingham	108	57	67	85	34	4	355
Ellsworth	0	1	1	11	3	0	16
Enfield	52	45	79	75	7	5	263
Epping	199	140	111	166	56	7	679
Epsom	127	89	97	107	43	12	475
Errol	8	31	17	10	2	2	70
Exeter	325	227	224	264	111	26	1177
Farmington	458	270	262	233	119	30	1372
Fitzwilliam	64	48	38	66	56	26	298
Francestown	24	1	27	27	6	2	87
Franconia	17	10	16	24	18	2	87
Franklin	814	486	477	438	132	45	2392
Freedom	44	32	37	51	31	12	207
Fremont	52	33	61	85	33	4	268
Gilford	164	142	202	224	66	14	812
Gilmanton	78	89	152	89	42	12	462
Gilsum	24	22	11	32	14	5	108
Goffstown	311	147	200	216	108	38	1020
Gorham	59	106	87	115	32	10	409
Goshen	27	16	46	42	19	12	162
Grafton	96	70	53	48	18	8	293
Grantham	10	15	6	11	10	0	52

Number of **Household Members** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Greenfield	36	35	41	38	17	5	172
Greenland	28	28	22	34	6	0	118
Greenville	103	74	166	110	45	10	508
Groton	19	21	28	25	20	3	116
Hampstead	64	85	48	106	27	21	351
Hampton	242	149	146	115	61	9	722
Hampton Falls	10	4	2	6	5	0	27
Hancock	41	11	36	28	8	1	125
Hanover	1	3	16	10	1	0	31
Harrisville	22	21	25	19	11	0	98
Haverhill	80	96	87	126	32	14	435
Hebron	23	33	36	16	6	0	114
Henniker	64	48	71	56	60	16	315
Hill	42	26	60	65	16	12	221
Hillsborough	295	242	265	240	110	36	1188
Hinsdale	178	147	167	222	56	20	790
Holderness	27	50	59	38	11	3	188
Hollis	50	24	35	39	18	3	169
Hooksett	275	148	229	271	99	16	1038
Hopkinton	87	29	51	57	35	18	277
Hudson	566	322	293	338	151	80	1750
Jackson	18	16	16	22	14	0	86
Jaffrey	170	153	151	144	61	15	694
Jefferson	18	13	30	20	12	0	93
Keene	570	549	618	639	254	117	2747
Kensington	4	3	6	12	3	0	28
Kingston	100	79	85	71	44	6	385
Laconia	1125	775	744	651	245	54	3594
Lancaster	91	156	175	156	49	4	631
Landaff	8	22	11	7	2	0	50
Langdon	4	17	30	10	9	6	76
Lebanon	201	215	174	96	60	16	762
Lee	95	52	71	90	20	6	334
Lempster	87	37	55	41	6	2	228
Lincoln	45	86	88	75	33	7	334
Lisbon	87	77	96	86	36	8	390
Litchfield	156	93	103	104	42	17	515
Littleton	28	5	12	9	11	0	65
Londonderry	322	232	274	215	108	36	1187
Loudon	85	133	86	111	64	18	497
Lyman	29	30	22	14	6	0	101
Lyme	4	4	12	12	6	0	38
Lyndeborough	29	18	11	30	7	5	100
Madbury	35	17	7	23	24	0	106
Madison	126	49	70	125	67	6	443
Manchester	8569	4882	4476	4077	1604	530	24138

Number of **Household Members** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Marlborough	44	44	40	47	27	9	211
Marlow	44	20	31	39	17	5	156
Mason	23	0	24	18	0	0	65
Meredith	357	193	259	252	123	37	1221
Merrimack	355	180	246	195	100	40	1116
Middleton	65	58	68	70	19	9	289
Milan	32	23	46	57	25	0	183
Milford	368	268	298	276	132	47	1389
Millsfield	3	3	0	0	0	0	6
Milton	318	243	251	220	63	37	1132
Monroe	16	14	26	22	3	0	81
Mont Vernon	39	18	44	41	10	7	159
Moultonborough	83	79	83	145	58	11	459
Nashua	4495	2361	2125	1954	821	280	12036
Nelson	10	28	16	1	1	4	60
New Boston	85	18	32	57	36	1	229
New Castle	0	0	3	1	0	1	5
New Durham	74	40	57	75	42	4	292
New Hampton	89	72	66	77	16	6	326
New Ipswich	126	69	98	70	21	22	406
New London	18	27	28	39	27	0	139
Newbury	30	16	10	35	15	6	112
Newfields	6	6	3	6	7	4	32
Newington	11	5	13	10	3	3	45
Newmarket	264	126	127	196	79	27	819
Newport	602	370	430	309	132	37	1880
Newton	57	48	38	44	33	9	229
North Hampton	57	39	29	41	7	6	179
Northfield	172	159	107	119	47	22	626
Northumberland	69	133	126	133	65	12	538
Northwood	142	116	94	101	34	13	500
Nottingham	41	23	42	82	18	10	216
Orange	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Orford	18	9	15	19	2	0	63
Ossipee	311	245	275	192	83	22	1128
Pelham	127	103	128	71	63	16	508
Pembroke	265	150	224	214	62	30	945
Peterborough	177	94	149	79	58	26	583
Piermont	22	8	26	21	6	0	83
Pittsburg	40	34	40	30	11	5	160
Pittsfield	217	166	137	168	60	20	768
Plainfield	41	11	20	16	5	1	94
Plaistow	98	66	85	105	32	15	401
Plymouth	167	140	140	136	86	12	681
Portsmouth	303	300	324	255	96	31	1309
Randolph	4	3	12	4	0	0	23

Number of **Household Members** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Raymond	360	221	322	273	147	33	1356
Richmond	15	20	18	46	24	2	125
Rindge	128	92	77	89	28	7	421
Rochester	2214	1305	1135	1046	403	97	6200
Rollinsford	77	56	46	25	18	12	234
Roxbury	14	4	6	3	3	0	30
Rumney	104	75	95	42	38	2	356
Rye	21	34	39	38	21	4	157
Salem	274	281	423	330	158	27	1493
Salisbury	27	13	29	33	2	2	106
Sanbornton	60	36	60	68	36	5	265
Sandown	37	61	78	51	38	14	279
Sandwich	16	20	15	24	11	0	86
Seabrook	418	275	322	218	79	38	1350
Sharon	0	10	6	0	6	0	22
Shelburne	4	8	0	5	2	1	20
Somersworth	981	465	410	399	124	60	2439
South Hampton	2	0	1	9	1	0	13
Springfield	37	38	23	19	7	0	124
Stark	11	19	20	12	12	0	74
Stewartstown	67	48	50	38	25	9	237
Stoddard	3	13	23	10	8	4	61
Strafford	79	48	50	18	33	8	236
Stratford	74	94	114	68	27	5	382
Stratham	75	35	12	18	10	1	151
Sugar Hill	12	1	10	10	2	2	37
Sullivan	37	22	25	36	33	2	155
Sunapee	61	42	68	89	22	16	298
Surry	49	19	2	13	7	4	94
Sutton	23	28	49	30	18	0	148
Swanzey	283	197	229	251	125	34	1119
Tamworth	98	179	144	115	36	18	590
Temple	35	15	22	22	17	0	111
Thornton	55	57	93	28	34	1	268
Tilton	146	91	120	142	72	25	596
Troy	125	146	149	128	65	7	620
Tuftonboro	51	55	56	64	33	5	264
Unity	27	22	35	24	14	4	126
Unknown	16	7	0	4	0	0	27
Wakefield	196	239	215	195	94	41	980
Walpole	91	44	69	59	28	25	316
Warner	69	44	78	53	31	21	296
Warren	37	54	33	41	10	12	187
Washington	36	30	55	34	9	10	174

Number of **Household Members** Benefitting from EAP
By Household Percent of Poverty Level

	<u>0%</u> <u>to 75%</u>	<u>76%</u> <u>to 100%</u>	<u>101%</u> <u>to 125%</u>	<u>126%</u> <u>to 150%</u>	<u>151%</u> <u>to 175%</u>	<u>over</u> <u>175%</u>	<u>Total</u>
Weare	225	119	156	148	88	11	747
Webster	6	12	17	68	35	5	143
Wentworth	31	32	58	24	11	7	163
Wentworths Loca	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Westmoreland	17	27	21	32	18	0	115
Whitefield	51	123	98	96	34	4	406
Wilmot	36	32	15	10	10	1	104
Wilton	99	85	89	85	41	12	411
Winchester	382	262	271	288	119	28	1350
Windham	57	34	62	84	20	14	271
Windsor	4	9	17	4	16	6	56
Wolfeboro	0	1	9	6	1	0	17
<u>Woodstock</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>236</u>
TOTAL	43760	29978	31022	29602	12396	3838	150564